



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Index Antiphonteus. Composuit FRANK LOVIS VAN CLEEF, Ph. D. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. V.) Published for the University by Ginn & Co., 1895.

To the grammarian, whose needs the makers of indexes have hitherto disregarded and on whose rights they have sometimes trampled, the Index Antiphonteus of Dr. Van Cleef will be a welcome innovation. The seeker after words and forms will find here what he desires, but for the latter he will often have to search under headings made for the benefit of the syntactician: and it need hardly be said that this principle of arrangement is fully justified by the paramount importance of oratorical syntax over oratorical vocabulary. The limitations of the second, like its occasional eccentricities, are largely conditioned by the theme; the restrictions imposed upon the first more distinctly result from an adherence to the standard of cultivated Athenian speech. And as this is for us the norm of comparison and basis of research, such material as is here collected is valuable alike to the plodding student of Greek composition and to the imaginative constructor of grammatical theory.

The method followed by Dr. Van Cleef is partly explained in his preface. Where no syntactical classification is necessary, the forms of noun or verb are arranged in the usual order of inflection; otherwise this order is observed only in the separate divisions of each article. In the case of verbs this system is modified by the natural treatment of the middle and passive apart from the active, whereby examples of the same construction may be separated; and under *πολύς*, II, *πλέον* with numerals follows *πλείονες*, apparently because it is equivalent to the latter. Substantives are cited by the nominative singular; needless exceptions to this rule occur in *ἐκλογεῖς* (it should at least be *ἐκλογῆς*), *ἔρανον*, *Ἔρμαι*, *εὐθυναί*. Under some substantives differences of meaning are indicated; the fact that this is done with no word after *δικη* seems to show the abandonment of a first intention which is disclaimed in the preface. If followed out, it might of course fairly be extended to adjectives; and under *ἀρχή*, 2, we might ask for a subdivision. The headings *de personis* and *de rebus* found under *ἀγαθός*, *ἀναγκαῖος*, *κακός* might be used with other adjectives, but, not being syntactical, are altogether unnecessary; their employment under *ἐκείνος*, *ὁδε*, *οὗτος* has more justification, and here *οὐτοσί* might have been included. Verbs are usually cited by the present indicative active, whether that voice occurs in Antiphon or not; some seemingly capricious exceptions to this practice appear, of which *αἰτέομαι*, *νοέομαι*, *ψηφίζομαι* are especially noticeable, since Antiphon uses active compounds of these verbs. Under each simple verb Dr. Van Cleef exhibits the prefixes with which it is compounded in the orator; and simple verbs not occurring are recorded with reference to the compounds which are found. The excellence of this system

is somewhat marred by too frequent errors. Under *βαίνω* we miss the prefixes *εις-, ἐκ, μετα-, μετεκ-, παρα-, συμ-, συνεις-, συνεπι-*; under *βάλλω, εις-, ἐκ, ἐμ-, μετα-, περι-, προς-, προσδια-, συμ-*; *βουλεύω, ἐπι-, συμ-*; *γίγνομαι, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, παρα-, περι-, συγ-*; *γινώσκω, κατα-, μετα-, προκατα-, προσκατα-, συγ-*; *γράφω, συγ-*; *διδάσκω, ἐκ-, ἡκω, προσ-*; *ἔημι, παρ-*; *κείμαι, παρα-*; *οἶχομαι, παρ-*; *σκέπτομαι, προ-*. Under *τείνω, τιμάω, τρέχω, προς-* is wrongly given for *προ-*; under *ἀμαρτάνω* we have a reference to *ἀφ-*, under *ἄπτομαι* to *ἀν-*, under *εἰμι* to *παρ-*, under *δμννμι* to *ἀπ-*, though none of these compounds appears in the Index or in the text of Blass. We miss the *simplicia* *ἀπατάω, βοάω, πέτομαι, ὠθέω*; the post-classical *ποντώ* might well have been omitted; and the verbs *δημέω* and *ἡρεάζω* exhibited by the Index do not exist. The propriety of citing un-Attic forms for an Attic author is doubtful; it would seem better to write, like Preuss, *βοηθῶ, τιμῶ sim*.

We read in the preface: "pauca de positione vocabulorum, de elisione vocalium adieci, si qua haec commoda videbantur." It was perhaps hardly necessary or wise to touch slightly on elisions, which are only a part of the larger question of hiatus; and within the limits apparently laid down by Dr. Van Cleef his treatment is inconsistent and incomplete. With *γε, δέ, οὐδέ, τε* he deals satisfactorily, opposing the cases of elision to those of hiatus; it would have been well to state the number in each kind, as is done for one kind only under *τε*. The observation under *διά* that elision is always found before a vowel would have sufficed for *ἐπί* and *μετά* (where it is needless to distinguish *ἐπ' and ἐφ', μετ' and μεθ'*) and should have been made also for *κατά* and *παρά*, where the subject is not mentioned, as it is also not under *οὔτε* (for which I find in Antiphon twenty-seven cases of elision against twenty-four of hiatus) and *μηδέ* (nine cases of elision, two of hiatus). Under *ἀλλά, ὑπό, οὗτος* only the elisions are noticed; we must supply for *ἀλλά* three certain cases of hiatus (III β 5, V 16, 58; perhaps another in VI 48 if the conjecture *αὐτά* be admitted) for *ὑπό* one (VI 32), for *τοῦτο, ταῦτα* thirty-eight (omitting VI 15); and here three cases of elision must be added (III δ 3, V 22, 38). Confusion is caused by the parenthetical adnotation under the accusative *ταῦτα* of seven out of the nine occurrences noticed under the heading *de elisione*.—The position of the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* (that is, the possible interposition of other words between it and the word to which it belongs) is treated parenthetically with each example; for *δέ, μέν, μή, οὐ, τε, πῶς* and the prepositions the same matter is dealt with under a separate heading; under *ἐν* the list of passages is not complete. The remark *uno loco περί scribitur* is an unscientific way of stating how often *περί* follows its substantive; and the phrase *verbum interponitur* under *ἐν* B 4 is not quite accurate, as the verb really divides not the preposition from its case, but the adjectival from the substantival dative. The classifications of *γε* and *ἐγωγε* are made according to the varying position of these words.—Combinations of particles are regularly recorded; and under *ὁ, καί, ἐκεῖνος* we find observations on crasis. It was superfluous to gather the examples of *ἐκ* and *ἐξ*, of *οὐ*, *οὐκ* and *οὐχ*; here Antiphon could only follow a universal rule.—Numerals placed at the end of each article show how often the word in question occurs in Antiphon. The editor should have explained his way of dealing with the fragments; we discover gradually that a fragment consisting of a single word is numbered only if the word is also found in an oration. Dr. Van Cleef seems to differ from Blass in regarding Fr. 58 as

actually cited by Aelian from Antiphon and in including *συντελείς* as well as *συντέλειαι* from Fr. 56.

In the following passages Dr. Van Cleef's syntax or his interpretation invites criticism. II β 9 is not an example of "ἀν—ἀν pro simpl. ἀν"; the first ἀν belongs to the participial clause. In II γ 8 the words *περὶ τῆς εἰδαιμονίας* belong not with *ἀποστερηθῇ*, but with *τρέμων*. It is incorrect to cite IV δ 2 and VI 12 as instances of the personal *δέω*, which is not found in Antiphon; they belong under *δεῖ*. In *ἐπὶ ξενίας*, II β 9, we have not an adjective with which *γῆς* is to be supplied, but a substantive, the phrase being equivalent to *ξένος ὧν* and exhibiting the sole Antiphontean instance of circumstantial *ἐπὶ* c. gen. Thus for *ξένιος* we should have *ξενία*; so *ἱερὸν* instead of *ἱερός*, for in all the passages where this word occurs it is a substantive meaning either 'shrine' or 'sacrifice.' *καὶ τίνος*, VI 34, is wrongly brought under *καί = etiam*, and the attempted classification (under *καί*, III 7) "post inter." is unmeaning; the two interrogative clauses are simply connected by *καί = et*. The first example under *καί*, III 8, also shows a connective, in the second the particle emphasizes the following noun; in neither case is there any other than a fortuitous connection with *μᾶλλον ἢ*. To speak (*καί* I 4 b, *τε* I 3 b) of an adverb connected by *τε—καί* with a participial or conditional clause is to ignore the complete fusion of the elements in *ἄλλως τε καί*, where the connectives had ceased to be habitually felt as such and the whole had the force only of a simple adverb. In II β 3 (cited under *καί* III 9) we have not an example of *καὶ εἰ*, nor in VI 23 (under *τε* II 2 b) an example of *τε—καί* connecting a substantive with a clause; for *εἰ τις = ὅστις* involves a substantival antecedent. The phrase *τῆς δίκης νικᾶσθαι*, V 87 = VI 5, belongs under *δίκη 3, iudicium*, not under I, *iustitia*; it presents the contrast to *τὴν δίκην παραβαίνειν* in the same passages. Under *ἐάν* I 1 c the heading "c. aliis partt. vel advv." is incorrect for all passages except the last; in the others *οὐκ* and *ἀλλὰ* belong not to the protasis, but to the hypothesis. The ethical dative *μοι* with *καλεῖν* and *μνησθῆναι* should not be put in one class with the indirect object; and in V 21 *μοι* probably depends on the complex *σύμπλουν γενέσθαι = συμπελῆσαι*. In IV δ 3 the datives *ἡμῖν* and *τούτῳ* depend on *κοινοῦ*, not on *ὄντος*; and in IV γ 5 *βιασάμενος ἡμᾶς χρῆσθαι*, the pronoun cannot properly be defined as the subject of the infinitive. In VI 43 it seems better to connect *βασιλέως* with *κατηγορήσων* and to join *εἰς τὰς εὐθύνas* with *ἦλθεν* (cf. Dem. 19, 2 *τῶν ἐπὶ τὰς εὐθύνas ἐλθόντων*); different are *εἰς τὸ πρᾶγμα κατηγορεῖν = λέγειν* (V 11 should be cited here as well as under the heading c. gen., since *φόνον = πρᾶγμα*) and *κατηγορῶν καὶ διαβάλλων εἰς τὸ δικάσθῃριον*, which is rightly treated under *εἰς* I b as parallel with *εἰσῆγγεῖλα εἰς τὴν βουλὴν*. Under μέλλω 4 the remark "sc. πιστοῦσθαι" should be cancelled; *μέλλοντα* is opposed to *παροιχόμενα*, future to past. In I 7 *ὁμολογούντων* is used absolutely. In I 31 the antecedent of *οἱ* is *θεοὶς* and μέλει is impersonal; for a murdered person is never spoken of as *ὁ ἡδικοημένος* (in III γ 7 it is not the murder but the failure to punish it that is defined as *ἀδικία*), and the notion that murder is *ἀσέβεια εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς* frequently recurs in the tetralogies; noteworthy is the use of *ἀδικεῖν = ἀσεβεῖν εἰς*, which may perhaps be explained in part by the desire for brevity. Under *ὅτε* we miss V 36, which is wrongly cited under *ὅτι* II 1 d; and *ὅτι—ἔστω*, V 87, is probably an object clause, not a causal. The parenthetical supplements under *οὐ* I 1 g

are wrong, the first two in form (for *βουλήσονται* read *βουλήσεσθε*, for *ἐστί* read *ἦν*), the last in sense; the unexpressed thought is *οὐδένα εἰς αἰτίαν ἄγω*. That the statement under *οὐ* V, "*οὐ—οὐ* pro simpl. *οὐ* scribitur," does not apply to V 63 Dr. Van Cleef seems to recognize by citing this passage correctly under *οὐ* C 3; but he has allowed the error to remain in close juxtaposition with the correction. In III γ 3 and VI 34 the first *οὐδέ* is not the conjunction, but the emphatic adverb. "*οὔτε simplex*" is an impossibility; in Fr. 19 the context is lacking, elsewhere the balancing clause is an affirmative one, variously introduced by *τοῦτο δέ, δέ, τε*. In VI 4 *ἄριστα* is an adverb; it is rightly so defined *sub voce*, wrongly as a substantive under *πράσσω* I 1; on the other hand, *πρῶτον* V 93 is not an adverb, but an adjective. "*πῶς c. perf.*," where the perfect is *εἰδείη*, shows a desertion of syntax for morphology. Neither Antiphon nor any other author uses *ὥσπερ* (= *ut*) with the infinitive; in IV δ 2 the infinitives are subjects of *κατὰ φύσιν ἐστί*, to be understood from the following clause.

The editor's classifications, usually very minute, are not always satisfactory. The phrases *de personis* and *de rebus* applied to prepositions are objectionable, first, because they are not syntactical divisions; secondly, because a preposition does not involve the notion of individuality as it involves that of place or of time; and thirdly, because in this way examples of the same construction may be separated without need. To say, as is said under *μηδέ, μηδείς, οὐδέ*, that in the case of double negatives the second has no negative force, is to regard the matter from an English, not a Greek, point of view; and this is true also of the definition "*μοι pro ἑπ' ἐμοῦ usurpatum*." The heading "*c. aliis negativis*," *μή* C and *οὐ* C, includes diversities of usage which should be defined; and the definition in *οὐ* C 3 might be made more precise. We read "*ἐσσι idem fere valet ac δύνανται*"; but as the impersonal *δύνανται* is not Attic, why not explain by *ἐξέστι*? "*κοινός* I, adi. 2. c. art." makes no contrast; we should have "*2. subst.*" It is jarring to find *nomen* and *substantivum* used indifferently; the second should of course be preferred. The heading *finalis* under *ἐπί* I 3 would include 5, which might be treated as a subdivision; as to 4, that should be fused with 3, the examples showing no different shade of meaning. Under *ὅς* IV the phrase "*pron. rel. pro demonstr. usurpatum*" is inexact, since we should rather expect the relative in these passages, and incorrect because in most of them a simple demonstrative could not well be substituted; usually a connective would be required unless the demonstrative were to be made emphatic by asyndeton, in which case it could not be displaced by the relative. In V 47 we might have *ἐχρῆν δὲ αὐτόν*, hardly *τούτον*; in V 46 (where *ἐνθυμείσθε = δεῖ ἐνθυμείσθαι*) the relative *ὃ* finds its antecedent in the following *τοῦτο—ὅτι—ἀπέκτειναν*, and in changing it to a demonstrative we should change the character of the sentence. The treatment of ordinary participles c. art. as substantives is open to objection; cf. *μάλα* II 1 a, *οὐ* I 3 b, d, *εἰμί* 6, in which last place we read: "*part. ὡν c. art. pro subst. pos.*" Of the examples adduced, II a 6 *μέρος τῶν ὄντων* alone shows a participle crystallized into a substantive; in *τῶν ἐσομένων*, V 6, the verbal force is so distinctly to be felt that we are not justified in regarding this as other than a *verbal* substantive—that is, a participle pure and simple—while in the other passages it is not the participle that could be turned into a substan-

tive, but the whole phrase, participle with prepositional clause, which has the value not of a substantive, but of a pure participle or adjective. (In τὰ ἐν ἀδῆλω ἐτ' ὄντα the verbal quality is brought out sharply by the adverb, which does not belong to the adjective, as Dr. Van Cleef would have it, s. v. ἐτι.) The treatment of ὄντων in τῶν μᾶλλον ἐν φόβῳ ὄντων as participle under μάλα II 3 b suggests a fluctuation of theories. Under μή I 5 b we read: "inf. sine art. pro subst. pos. verbi subi. est"; but the infinitive is used as subject not in place of a substantive, but because it is the substantive of the verb. Here exactness demands that the use of infinitive with subject-accusative as subject (as in II β 8) be distinguished from the simple infinitive; and in III β 4 the infinitive is not appositive, but object, οὐδεὶς ἂν λόγος ὑπελείπετο being equivalent to οὐκ ἂν ἐδυνάμεθα ἀρνεῖσθαι. Classification f of περί, "c. verbo εἶναι," would apply equally to II δ 9 cited just above, where τάναντία is subject, περί τῆς εὐδαιμονίας predicate; and περί πολλοῦ εἶναι might perhaps better be classed with περί πολλοῦ ποιεῖσθαι, unless the relation of the prepositional phrase as object and predicate be distinctly defined. The pluperfect ὑπῆρκετο, V 58, is clearly passive = *susceptum erat*; on the other hand, how does Dr. Van Cleef distinguish between the passive πείθεσθαι, V 94, and the middle voice to which all other instances of this form are referred? It would have been better to distinguish the substantival from the adjectival use of πᾶς than to write under 4 b "loco pron. pos."

Some minor slips and omissions may be noted briefly. Of headings which are omitted the following seem not unimportant: ἄξιον c. acc. et inf., I 24; βιάζομαι 1. med. 2. pass.; γιγνώσκω 3 c. part. ad subi. referendo (as under δηλώω 3); διώκω c. gen. rei, VI 9; ἐπικαλέω pass. c. ὧς, III β 9; καταγιγνώσκω pass. c. gen., V 70; κείμαι 4. c. acc. et inf.; πειράζομαι 1. c. inf. 2. c. part. 3. c. gen.; ἀπιστος 2. c. acc. et inf.; ὧς I adv. Under λέγω 6 we read: "c. ὧς vel ὅτι"; but the examples show only ὧς. Passages are sometimes quoted under the wrong heading; so under δηλώω 2 and ὅπως 2, the last two examples; ἐπίσταμαι 3. V 82; ἕτερος I 1, V 36; ἱκανός, VI 46, 48; μάλα B, the cases where μᾶλλον qualifies εἰκός. The vocatives κριταί and κίριοι should end their respective articles; φανερός γενόμενος is not an example of that adjective "c. part." It is incorrect to separate ἀμαρτάνειν, παροινεῖν εἰς from ἀσεβεῖν εἰς; and under ἐν real confusion exists, since many of the examples toward the end of I belong under 2. Responsibility for the following mistakes is in part shared by the printer: αἰνέω, ἐξ- (read ἐπ-); ἄλλος, τᾶλλα, elsewhere τἄλλα, in accordance with Blass; ἀναβοέω; "ἀναδείκνυμι, ἀναδέξαι, Fr. 47" should read "ἀναδέχομαι, ἀνάδεξαι," as Dr. Van Cleef knows, since he refers to ἀνα- under δέχομαι, not under δέκνυμι; ἀριθμός; τότε μέν—τότε δε, p. 35; θυμέομαι, with false references to ἐν-, προ-. Under τε II 4 for *quattuor* read *quingue*. *Continenta*, p. 55, *conditionibus*, p. 67, *utremque*, p. 82, are distressing misprints; εἰκός should not be translated by a masculine; the distinction made, under γῆ, between *terra* and *tellus* is false; the phrase "de eo cuius causa agitur" under ἐπί I 4 is at least ambiguous. Finally, while the quotations usually exhibit, as they are intended to do, the construction or relation of the words, this is occasionally obscured or falsified by misleading omissions or insertions.

The preface assures us that the citations have been most carefully verified: "maxima diligentia," says Dr. Van Cleef sadly, "cui par nullum praeium

bene scio me umquam adepturum." If a good conscience is not a sufficient reward, the editor may reflect that the indexes of similar character which he hopes to publish later will be all the more warmly welcomed by scholars and students, who will trust to find in them the same accuracy combined with a more perfect clearness of syntactical vision.

WM. HAMILTON KIRK.

---

ITALO PIZZI: *Storia della poesia persiana*. Vol. I, II. Torino, Unione tipografico-editrice, 1894. xxiv, 350 pp. and 495 pp. Svo. Lire 10.

"Die Poesie steht zur Bildung des Menschen in einer zwiefachen Beziehung: in einer der *Form*, indem sie Wahrheit und Lehre durch Einkleidung und rhythmischen Ausdruck der Einbildungskraft näher zu bringen sucht, und in einer des *Inhalts*, indem sie überall das Erhabenste, Reinste und Schönste aufsuchend, im Menschen immer das Höchste und Geistigste seiner Natur anzueignen bemüht ist, und ihm beständig vor Augen hält, dass er den vorübergehenden Genuss der dauernden inneren Genugthuung, das Irdische dem Unendlichen nachsetzen und im Widerstreit der Neigungen und Pflichten Alles, durch Selbstbeherrschung und Erhebung über das Niedere und Gemeine, dem Adel und der Reinheit der Gesinnung opfern muss." With these words of Wilhelm von Humboldt I may be allowed to begin my review of the well-disposed work in two volumes, which Italo Pizzi, who is already known by specialists for his extensive studies on Persian literature, and whose excellent translation of the whole *Shāhnāme* into Italian was duly appreciated by me in this Journal (vol. XIV, 1, pp. 93-101), presents not to scholars only, but to a cultivated public in general, as the fruit of many years' studies. Pizzi has studied no less than 129 poets for the purpose, and the list of the consulted books and MSS given on pp. xiv-xxiv proves the extensiveness of his knowledge. The reader is attracted by the ample contents and captivated by elegant representing and tasteful, aesthetic judgment. Especial care was bestowed by the author upon the characteristic of the personalities as well as of the different periods of Persian literature, and he generally succeeded excellently in this respect.

We will try to enter into the particulars of the book. After an excellent introduction, Cap. I gives a general survey of the rise, development and the different periods of Persian poetry, ingeniously pointing out the precursors of each and the relations to middle or old Persian literature; Cap. II treats the lyric, Cap. III the mystic and sceptic poetry. Cap. IV is merely consecrated to the celebrated poets Saadi and Hafiz, and concludes the first volume. Vol. II, Cap. V treats the epic poetry, Firdausi and the cyclic poets; Cap. VI the 'poesia romanzesca' and the 'poeti romanzeschi,' especially *Nizāmi*, *Khusrev di Dehli*, *Khāg'ā Kirmāni*, *Assār*, *Sāveghi*, *Fattāhi*. These chapters, which give the development of the Iranian epos and its transition into the romantic epos of *Nizāmi*, seem to me the most brilliant parts of the book, and this is not surprising, the Persian national epos and its further romantic development in the time of the epigons having been Pizzi's favorite study from the beginning of his learned career. While Cap. VII gives the moral and gnostic literature and its representatives, and Cap. VIII treats merely of *Gāmi* and his literary